

REMARKS

The present Preliminary Amendment is being filed together with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Reconsideration and allowance of the application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully are requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 34-39, 41-43, 45, 46, 48-53, 55, and 56 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29, 35, 43, and 49 being independent.

Claims 2, 5, 12, 16, 19, 26, 30, 33, 40, 44, 47, and 54 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 34-39, 41-43, 45, 46, 48-53, 55 and 56 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

§ 112 Rejection

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29, 35, 43 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action states that the “specification fails to disclose any descriptions regarding ‘determining whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processor’ and notification means for displaying a message that the instructed print job has not been interrupt printed if said detection means ‘determines that the owner of the print job is identical to the user of the information processor.’” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites in part a detecting unit adapted for receiving job information from the printer indicating that interrupt printing of the print job instructed by the instruction unit has failed, the job information including information that can

specify an owner of the print job, and determining whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus based on the job information.

Independent Claim 7, as amended, recites in part a transfer unit, adapted for transferring, to the one information processing apparatus, job information indicating that the interrupt printing of the received print job has failed, the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, if the decision unit decides that the print job is not to be interrupt printed, wherein the one information processing apparatus causes a display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed, if it is decided based on the job information transferred by the transfer unit that the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus.

Support for these features can be found in the original specification at least as follows:

(1) “At the step (S401), job information is acquired from the printer 2. At the step (S402), job management information in the job information is referred to” (page 11, lines 2-4);

(2) “The determination result as to whether a print job can be interrupt-processed is added to the job management information for that print job and the host computer is notified of it according to the information representing destinations to be notified, as required” (page 9, lines 4-9);

(3) “This [third data processing procedure in the information processor] corresponds to the step (S403) shown in FIG. 4 to display the job information” (page 11, lines 15-16);

(4) “At the step (S501), job management information is referred to. At the step (S502), a list of print jobs is generated based on the job management information. FIG. 6 shows an example of a list of print jobs. In the window of FIG. 6, the document name, status, owner, and data size are displayed for each job” (page 11, lines 18-23);

(5) “Therefore, if it is determined at the step (S503) that a notice that an interrupt print had not been processed successfully is given, the process proceeds to the step (S506). At the step (S506), the attached job information is checked and at the step (S507), it is determined whether the user of the host computer desired the interrupt-instructed print job” (page 12, lines 14-20); and

(6) “FIG. 7 shows an example of the notice given at the step (S509)” (page 13, lines 5-7).

Accordingly Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Independent Claims 15, 29, and 43 are directed to a method, a program, and a computer-readable memory medium, respectively, and recite features corresponding to those of Claim 1 discussed above. Claims 35, 21, and 49 are directed to a method, a program, and a computer-readable memory medium, respectively, and recite features corresponding to those of Claim 7 discussed above. Therefore, those claims are likewise supported by the original specification.

Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 15, 17-18, 20, 29, 31, 32, 34, 43, 45, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,206,735 (Gauronski et al.) in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,170 B1 (Ban). Claims 7, 9-14, 21, 23-28, 35, 37-42, 49 and 51-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,130,757 (Yoshida et al.) in view of the Ban patent. Claims 8, 22, 36, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Yoshida et al. and Ban patents in view of the Gauronski et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, relates to an information processing apparatus which can communicate with a printer. The information processing apparatus comprises a generation unit, an instruction unit, and a notification unit, as well as the detection unit discussed above. The generation unit is adapted for generating a print job to be processed by the printer, based on application data. The instruction unit is adapted for instructing any of the generated print jobs to be interrupt printed by the printer. The detection unit is adapted for receiving job information from the printer indicating that interrupt printing of the instructed print job has failed, wherein the job information includes information that can specify an owner of the print job. Based on the received job information, the detection unit determines whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus. The notification unit is adapted for causing a display unit to display that the instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, if the detection unit determines that the owner of the print job is identical to the user of the information processing apparatus.

Independent Claim 7 relates to a print controller which can process print jobs from a plurality of information processing apparatuses. The print controller comprises an interrupt unit, a determination unit, and a decision unit, as well as the transfer unit discussed above. The interrupt unit is adapted for suspending print operation for a print job and executing

interrupt printing of another print job according to an instruction for interrupt printing. The determination unit is adapted for determining whether a print job for the interrupt printing is currently present. The decision unit is adapted for, in response to reception of an interrupt-instructed print job from one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses, deciding whether the received print job is to be interrupt printed, based on a determination provided by the determination unit. The transfer unit is adapted for transferring, to the one information processing apparatus, job information indicating that the interrupt printing of the received print job has failed, the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, if the decision unit decides that the print job is not to be interrupt printed. The one information processing apparatus causes a display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed, if it is decided based on the job information transferred by the transfer unit that the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus.

The Gauronski et al. patent discloses inhibiting multiple interrupt printing jobs, and sending to the operator a message that interrupt printing has failed. When the parameters of an interrupt job require a function that cannot currently be performed (for example, when a particular type of paper needed for a job is not loaded in the paper tray) a message is displayed that the system is not ready. The Yoshida et al. patent discloses changing the order of executing print jobs in accordance with priorities assigned to the respective print jobs.

However, Applicant submits that the Gauronski et al. and Yoshida et al. patents, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can even be combined), fail to disclose or suggest various features of independent Claims 1 and 7. For example, the cited documents lack a detection unit, adapted for receiving job information from

the printer indicating that interrupt printing of the instructed print job has failed, the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, and determining whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus based on the job information, as presently recited in Claim 1. Further, the cited documents lack a transfer unit adapted for transferring job information indicating that the interrupt printing of the received print job has failed, the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, if the decision unit decides that the print job is not to be interrupt printed, wherein the one information processing apparatus causes a display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed, if it is decided based on the job information transferred by the transfer unit that the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus, as presently recited in Claim 7.

The Office Action contends that these features are taught by the Ban patent at column 4, lines 20-52 and column 5, lines 40-56. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Ban patent teaches a printing apparatus with job interrupt capabilities. When the user selects one of previously loaded print jobs that require special paper on the operation panel, the printing apparatus executes printing of the selected print job in priority over other print jobs that designate ordinary paper. That is, printing of an ordinary job J1 is suspended in response to the turning on of the manual feed button 32 or the selection of the manual feed job after the manual feed button 32 is turned on.

The description at column 4, lines 20-52 of the Ban patent is associated with Figs. 4 and 5. Fig. 4 merely shows files managed in the printer (and Fig. 8 shows in detail the schedule management file 130 of Fig. 2). Fig. 5 shows a processing in the host computer, where

in response to the user inputting a user name and designating a paper type, a print job is sent to the printer. The description at column 5, lines 40-56 is associated with Fig. 11, which shows a flowchart for schedule management corresponding to Fig. 8. The flowchart shows a processing for executing a manual feed job selected on the panel by the user in priority over the other jobs.

However, the Ban patent fails to remedy the deficiencies in the Gauronski et al. and Yoshida et al. patents noted above with respect to Claims 1 and 7. In particular, the Ban patent has no relation to an information processing apparatus that can communicate with a printer and generates a print job to be processed by the printer, based on application data. Rather, in the Ban patent, the processing is carried out in the printer to determine the priority in which print jobs are to be printed (see e.g., col. 4, line 56 - col. 5, line 25 and lines 41-65). There is no disclosure or suggestion of a detection unit adapted for receiving job information from the printer indicating that interrupt printing of the print job instructed by the instruction unit has failed, as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, there is also no disclosure or suggestion in the Ban patent of a notification unit adapted for causing a display unit to display that the instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, as also recited in independent Claim 1.

For substantially the same reasons, the Ban patent also does not disclose or suggest a transfer unit of a print controller adapted for transferring, to the one information processing apparatus, job information indicating that the interrupt printing of the received print job has failed, the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, if the decision unit decides that the print job is not to be interrupt printed, as presently recited in independent Claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the cited art. Independent Claims 15, 29, and 43 are directed to a method, a program, and a computer-readable memory medium, respectively, and recite features corresponding to those of Claim 1 discussed above. Claims 21, 35, and 49 are directed to a method, a program, and a computer-readable memory medium, respectively, and recite features corresponding to those of Claim 7 discussed above. Therefore, those claims are likewise patentable over the cited art.

Accordingly, the independent claims are submitted to be patentable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

The dependent claims also are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, as well as for the additional features which they recite.

Individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue at the Examiner's early convenience are respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Divine", written over a horizontal line.

David A. Divine
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,275

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DAD\gmc

DC_MAIN 201775v1